UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/823,075	04/12/2004	Olivier Golibrodski	5974-155	3982
	7590 04/17/200 IANCE US LLP	8	EXAMINER	
31 WEST 52NI	O STREET	SAX, STEVEN PAUL		
NEW YORK, NY 10019-6131			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/823,075	GOLIBRODSKI ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Steven P. Sax	2174		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>27 D</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This Since this application is in condition for alloward closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro			
Disposition of Claims				
 4) Claim(s) 5-12,16-19,21-23,26-30 and 42-44 is, 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-12,16-19 and 21 is 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 22-23, 26-30, 42-44 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	/are withdrawn from consideration	n.		
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to by the I drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 2174

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This application has been examined.
- 2. The RCE and amendment filed 12/27/07 have been entered.
- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 22-23, 26-27, 29-30, 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami et al (6295063) and Gilley et al (5745666).
- 5. Regarding claim 22, Minami et al show: a computer system operation method for displaying a computer-generated three-dimensional model of an object on a display (abstract), the method comprising the steps of: converting the computer generated three-dimensional model of the object to a computer generated two-dimensional visualization of the object (Figures 13, 14, 15, 45, column 13 line 55 column 14 line 25, column 16 lines 1-25), said computer generated three-dimensional model of the object being in one of a plurality of projection planes, and said computer-generated two-dimensional visualization of the object being in a first selected

Application/Control Number: 10/823,075

Art Unit: 2174

projection plane from said plurality of selection planes (Figures 20, 22, 23, 35, column 16 line 59 – column 17 line 45, column 18 lines 10-55). Minami et al do not go into the interactive details of receiving a second selected projection plane for said two-dimensional visualization, displaying said two-dimensional visualization in said second selected projection plane, and generating the projection of said three-dimensional model in said second selected projection plane after said two-dimensional visualization in said second selected projection plane has been displayed, but do mention plural projection sequences (column 27 lines 25-60). Furthermore, Gilley et al show this for a computer generated model, to aid in projection sequences (column 3 lines 13-35, column 5 lines 10-40, column 7 lines 35-60). It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in Minami et al, because it would allow convenient sequences of projections and visualizations.

Page 3

- 6. Regarding claim 23, the display of the two dimensional visualization is limited to pixel data (column 14 lines 1-20)
- 7. Regarding claim 26, the steps of receiving a second selected projection plane and displaying said two-dimensional visualization in said second selected projection plane are iteratively repeated (Figure 6, column 12 lines 7-40), and the step generating the projection of said three-dimensional model of the object to in said second selected projection plane includes the step of receiving an approval for said second selected projection plane and displaying said three-dimensional model in said second selected

Art Unit: 2174

projection plane after receiving said approval (Figure 53, column 24 lines 1-35).

8. Regarding claim 27, the step of receiving a second selected projection plane includes the step of providing a manipulator tool button for selecting said second projection plane (Gilley et al column 8 lines 25-45. The obviousness to have this in Minami et al is the same as that in paragraph 5 of this Office Action).

.

- 9. Regarding claim 29, the manipulator tool includes a programmable interactive button and wherein the step of displaying said two-dimensional visualization in said second selected projection plane includes the step of displaying said two-dimensional visualization in said second selected projection plane in response to an activation of the programmable interactive button (Gilley et al column 8 lines 25-45. The obviousness to have this in Minami et al is the same as that in paragraph 5 of this Office Action).
- 10. Regarding claim 30, in addition to that mentioned for claim 22, note a user interactive device tracking the circumference of a circle displayed on said computer screen, wherein selecting the interactive device and rotating it in a clockwise or counterclockwise direction will cause said first projection plane to rotate about an axis which is perpendicular to the computer screen (Minami et al column 37 lines 15-50. The obviousness to have this as a tool button is the same as that mentioned in paragraph 5 of this Office Action).

Art Unit: 2174

11. Claim 42 shows the same features as claim 22 and is rejected for the same reasons.

- 12. Regarding claim 43, selecting the interactive device and various other controls is accomplished by clicking a pointing device controlling a cursor while the cursor is positioned over the interactive device (Minami et al column 9 lines 57-65 and Gilley et al column 8 lines 25-45).
- 13. Regarding claim 44, the interactive device is incorporated into a graphical manipulator software tool (Gilley et al column 8 lines 25-45. The obviousness to have this in Minami et al is the same as that mentioned in paragraph 5 of this Office Action).
- 14. Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minami et al (6295063) and Gilley et al (5745666) and LaHood (5874956).
- 15. Regarding claim 28, in addition to that mentioned for claim 30, neither Minami et al nor Gilley et al go into the details that the manipulator tool includes a plurality of quadrants, each of said plurality of quadrants representing a predetermined number of degrees of rotation in a predetermined direction around an orthogonal axis, but see paragraph 10 in this Office Action and note the rotating and obviousness to have this in a manipulator tool. Now, LaHood does show the plurality of quadrants feature as

Application/Control Number: 10/823,075

Art Unit: 2174

described (Figure 5, column 6 for example). This feature in the combination already suggested by Minami et al and Gilley et al then would be such that receiving a second projection plane includes the step of receiving a selected one of said plurality of quadrants and rotating said first selected projection plane said predetermined number of degrees and in said predetermined direction around said orthogonal axis associated with said selected quadrant. It would in fact have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this in the combination of Minami et al and Gilley et al, because it would allow convenient rotating of the projection plane.

Page 6

- 16. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven P. Sax whose telephone number is (571) 272-4072. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday, 8:30 AM 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Wiley can be reached on (571) 272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Steven P Sax/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174
